(SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.)

STATEMENT "B"

Percentage of passes during the last two years.

		1951 (Nov.)	1952 (May.)	1952 (Nov.)	1953 (May.)
1	Revenue Higher ...	31	34	13	15
2	Revenue Lower ...	52.5	34	41.75	31.5
3	Criminal Higher ...	38	44.5	22.5	46.7
4	Criminal Lower ...	46.6	46	33.5	50
5	Civil Part I ...	50	100	60	38.4
6	Civil Part II	36	48	46	11.4
7	Accounts Higher ...	46.7	60	44.4	48.8
8	Accounts Lower ...	48	43	40	33.8
9	Registration ...	52	67.6	55	50
10	Excise ...	57	60	66	55.5
11	Forest ...	72	53	50	69.2
12	Muzrai ...	69	90	48	69.2
13	Co-operative Inspectors' Examination.	53.5	28	25	42.3
14	Municipal and Local Boards ...	40.75	57.6	47	19.4
15	Sales-Tax Higher ...	50	69	42	46.6
16	Sales-Tax Lower ...	37.5	87	88	33
17	Labour Laws ...	100	50	Absent	100
18	Prisons ...	75	66	100	100
19	Law of Practice and Procedure ...	25	66	100	Absent

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1953-54.

(*Laying on the Table*).

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, as required by Article 205 (1) (*b*) of the Constitution of India I lay on the table of the House a copy of the statement of Supplementary Estimates for the year 1953-54.

Statement by the Home Minister.

*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—Sir, with your permission I desire to make a statement of personal explanation.

On Saturday when a question tabled by Sri P. R. Ramaiya was taken up I was in the House. But the Hon'ble Member who tabled the question was not present in the House and hence the question was passed over. In fact there were two other questions relating to my Department which when called by the Chair could not be taken up due to the absence of the Members, but all through this time I was in the House. Later on I was urgently called to the Legislative Council as some questions relating to my Department were stated to have been held up in that House due to my absence. Since my questions in the Assembly were in a way disposed of and as my presence in the Council was necessary I left the Assembly and went to the Council. It would appear that when these questions were called for a second time and the Hon'ble the Revenue Minister undertook to answer the question of Sri P. R. Ramaiya on my behalf, the Chair made certain remarks about my absence. In order that there may be no misunderstanding on this point I am making this statement. I had to leave the Assembly because I was called to the Council and I thought

that as my questions were called from the Chair and disposed of there would be no longer any need for my presence in the Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard the explanation of the Hon'ble the Home Minister. Although the remarks which I made on Saturday arose in connection with a question relating to the Department of the Minister for Home and Industries, I may state that my remarks were in the nature of a general observation. Rule 24 runs as follows:—

> "the first hour of every day of meeting shall be available for the asking and answering of questions."

Then rule 32 is as follows:—

> "When all the questions for which answer is desired have been called, the Speaker may, if time permits, call again any question which has not been put by reason of the absence of the member in whose name it stands, and may also permit a member to put a question standing in the name of another member, if so authorised by him."

This is the procedure. Since a large number of questions were not taken up due to the absence of some members in the morning, as per rule 32, I called such of the members who came in just then to put questions if they so desired. This is one thing.

While the Revenue Minister was making or made an attempt to answer a question put by one of the Hon'ble Members, the actual remark that I made on that day is as follows:—

> "The difficulty is the Revenue Minister is not in charge of the Department. He is not briefed to answer this question. . . ."

This is obvious from the statement or rather the explanation made by the Hon'ble Minister himself, namely, that since there were no more questions of his he left the House since his presence in the other House was urgent. I added:

> ". . . I am sorry to say in this connection that if the other Ministers are in the other House that could be excused; otherwise I do not know what to say."

It will thus be seen that my remarks related to those Ministers who were neither in this House nor in the Council and whose questions could not be taken up due to their absence.

Demands for Supplementary Grants for 1953-54.

(Time fixed for Discussion).

Mr. SPEAKER.—As regards supplementary estimates, I suppose copies have been distributed?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narsipur).—Yes.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—I would like to know whether supplementary demands would be taken up?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is noted in the agenda itself that it will be taken up to-day at 5 P.M.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Then, where is the time for us to send notice of cut motions? We are empowered to send cut motions on Budget demands. The rules provide for three days' time being given to us to send notices of cut motions. So for three days after the presentation of demands, they cannot be taken up unless the Chair . . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will make a statement regarding that. Hon'ble Members might have noticed that certain demands for additional and supplementary grants for the year 1953-54 have been included in to-day's list of business. As copies of the motions and statement of supplementary estimates were not given to the members sufficiently in advance, it was not perhaps possible for them to give notice of cut motions. Normally, it is desirable that demands for supplementary grants should be available to the members well in time to enable them to study the estimates and to table cut motions, if any. However, on the present occasion, it will be seen that without exception every demand for a supplementary grant is in the nature of a token demand.